

PNNST AC Meeting Notes 11/2-11/3 2016

Note taker: Kevin Walton

11/2

1. Ben J. – Introduction and Housekeeping
 - a. AC and staff Introductions
 - b. Erik Smith (NPS) opening statement
 - c. Tiegen Tomlin (Glacier NPS) – Glacier and NPS history and background
2. Becky Blanchard
 - a. Icebreaker
3. Matt McGrath
 - a. Comp Plan refresher Powerpoint
 - b. Brief summary of Q&A (and statements) from AC members
 - i. **Jessie Grossman – Would like a list of IDT members for AC members to contact. Can FS send document when available (PIL)? Matt – yes, the documents will be posted.** IDT members are not full time on this project so we may not release their names.
 - ii. Jeff Chapman – Local dialogue is needed for private and other landowners. Some landowners are not aware of the trail that crosses their property. All landowners need to be made aware of the location. **Matt- we have FS employees researching ownership and we will be contacting affected owners based on CDR.** We have been trying to address this at local planning meetings.
 - iii. James Michaud – It would help for AC members to have sideboards based on NEPA or other agency restrictions to make recommendations. It is important for user groups and the public get involved during the planning process, not after the fact. – Becky B – recommendations from AC are important to develop alternatives. **Existing condition reports will be shared with the AC.** Matt – we are looking for recommendations on P&N and trail-wide desired conditions this round. Recommendations will be used to help develop a range of alternatives. Recommendations may not always be feasible based on NEPA analysis and that feedback will be provided. The IDT needs recommendations in order to evaluate effects and mitigation. Community input is needed and appreciated.
 - iv. Dan Dinning – Community members are concerned that proposals/plans will just be presented and implemented after decisions are already made. Matt – community input will help develop alternatives and it is required by law.
 - v. Diane Barlow – There has been lots of press on this AC meeting and trail so many of the effected the communities are well aware.
 - vi. Mike Dawson – There are lots of communities along the trail with differing opinions. How do we know who to contact since the actual location is not determined. How specific will the comp plan be for actual location? Matt – we are just looking at the CDR for now. The comp plan can identify general reroutes, plans to remove from roads, etc. It will be as specific as needed. Site specific locations will not be determined.

- vii. Almer Casile – Will desired condition recommendations be based on using the CDR? Matt – Yes.
 - 4. Matt, Becky, Lindsey, and Craig – Rec. Trail Uses
 - a. Craig – Trail Classes Powerpoint
 - i. Jeff Kish, Jeff Chapman, Brock Millern, Rosemary Seifried – how can trail class be used to effect/manage use? Users will do what they want to do. Trail class needs to be determined based on the desired use and not a representation of a lack of maintenance or degraded condition. Craig – we look at existing uses and try to match the class needed to support these or predicted future uses. However, trail class could be used to increase challenge to discourage some users before they reach a known obstacle or hazard. Partnerships can be used to help maintain the designated trail class. Matt – the website has trail class listed on FS portions. Trail class will be useful to help the AC with desired condition recommendations.
 - b. Beck and Lindsey – Allowed Uses Powerpoint
 - i. Dan Dinning – Can the comp plan match what is on the ground? Becky – yes. The status quo should be part of the alternatives.
 - ii. **Rosemary Seifried - FS needs to update map to reflect type of pack animals allowed (goats, Lamas, etc.)**
 - iii. **Brad Smith – Can updates to the map be submitted online by users or local managers to refine actual trail locations. Lindsey – we will look in to ways that others can submit updates for the FS to compare to corporate data.** FYI, this map is a general overview and should not be relied on for site specific detail.
 - iv. Becky B. and Matt M. – overview of interactive trail map and sensing activity
 - 1. Question for sensing activity:
 - a. What should the primary trail uses be?
 - i. A list of possible uses/combinations were provided to the group on a flip chart including an “other” option. The group is encouraged to look at both primary uses and prohibited uses. There was discussion on bikes being allowed on the trail versus targeted.
 - ii. Jeff Chapman stated not targeting bikes would adversely impact support from users groups, officials, and the public along some stretches of the trail.
 - iii. Dan Dinning asked about motorized use. Matt M - Existing motorized would not necessarily be changed unless it was something the group would want to recommend.
 - iv. Matt McGrath – Recommend we postpone this discussion and a vote until later. **The question and choices will need to be reworded before voting.**
5. Matt McGrath - Nature and Purposes
 - a. Power Point presentation
 - b. Ben J. – review N&P statement

- c. Voting on N&P
 - i. Live with Minor Changes (13)
 - ii. Live As-is (7)
 - iii. Fully Support (4)
- d. Changes (Ben J. Captured on flip chart)
 - i. Diane Barlow – wildlife education component
 - ii. **Dan Dinning – will the mountain biking statement change based on earlier discussion about bikes. Matt – May need to review and adjust statement as necessary.**
 - iii. Jeff Kish – Add information about the communities
 - iv. Diane Priebe – Add partnership component
 - v. Raynelle Rino-Southon – Would like to have indigenous communities included
 - vi. Jessie Grossman – Possibly add descriptors to describe communities
- e. Working landscapes
 - i. Brock Milliern – Timber harvesting needs to be included as part of the working landscape. The trail should not try to avoid working landscape such as timber harvests. Language or lack of language can be used to influence changes politically and can result in changes on how land is managed down the road. This document could be used to oppose certain land management activities down the road if these uses are not addressed.
 - ii. Rosemary Seifried – *summary from Wendy's notes* - The NPS thought National Parks would be enough to provide for opportunities. However, use exceeded capacity. This trail should be considered as another opportunity for the public to experience nature.
 - iii. Jeff Chapman – There is a lot of land that does not fit a traditional trail definition. Working landscapes are very important to the route
 - iv. Mike Dawson – What are working landscapes: Mine pits, windmill farms, etc. are all part of working landscapes. However, users are not looking for these experiences. Landscape definitions needs to be narrowed down. Would oppose this language if not better defined. Does not think a National Scenic Trails should include all working landscapes.
 - v. Jeff Kish – Perhaps leave working landscape out. Not including language on working landscapes does not prevent these usages from happening on the land and just because it is not in the N&P does not mean it will be ignored - the Comp plan can address it.
 - vi. Almer Casile – Understands Mike and Jeff's concerns. When the box is so large, a lot of things will fit in it which opens the door to many possibilities. Adverse impacts and limits need to be better defined.
 - vii. Dan Dinning – Concerned about language that does not allow certain management activities. Thinks it needs to be addressed. If it is not addressed in the N&P, can it be addressed in the Comp plan legally? Matt M. – yes, not everything can be included in the N&P.

- viii. Jessie Grossman – Are there other phrases to address management of certain working landscapes. Mike Dawson – this plan cannot necessarily tell land owners or local managers how to use or manage the land.
 - ix. Diane Barlow – Suggested we include David Kennedy’s language.
 - x. Kevin Knauth – This is very complicated. Prefers managed vs working. An absence of language or addressing an issue does not work well for agencies and will not help in finding solutions.
 - f. Any objections to proposed additions
 - i. Wildlife education – Wendy Walker has concern about including some but not all subtopics.
 - ii. See Ben J. flip chart notes
- 6. Wendy Walker and Rosie Motsomoto – Gathering data for interpretive plan
 - a. Gathering stories
 - i. Significance Statements
 - 1. Rosie presentation – will be working on completing an Interp plan during the next year
 - a. Small group activity to gather significant statements (flip charts)
- 7. Public Comments (handouts and notes available)
 - a. Amy Robinson – NWA
 - i. Oldest grassroots wilderness organization
 - ii. Recovering Grizzly populations
 - iii. We need to be thoughtful and deliberated with forward thinking vision of the PNT. Consider options that do not focus only on humans
 - iv. Ensure a solid plan is vetted for both humans and wildlife
 - v. Consider Grizzly friendly alternative
 - b. Brian Peck ?
 - i. Working on grizzly recovery.
 - ii. From listening to the meeting, priorities are clearly focused on recreation not wildlife.
 - iii. Buffer by 500 meters and consider as road for impacts should be used.
 - iv. National Park use has grown significantly but no representative from the NPS is on the council
 - v. Wildlife biologists are not represented
 - vi. Handout?
 - c. Keith Hammer ?
 - i. Recreation trail use does not need a booster club (reference to E. WA brochure)
 - ii. This is critical wildlife habitat
 - iii. Wildlife is a big part of what drives people here
 - iv. Too many high use trails does not meet Grizzly protection needs/requirements
 - v. The current forest plan does not allow this type of use through the core habitat
 - vi. Proposes moving trail to front country locations
 - vii. Handout
 - d. James Michaud
 - i. Process we are using is backwards

- ii. A lot of time and energy was spent
- iii. Better explain nature and purpose process
- iv. The FS does not give a lot of guidance, therefore, each council has had to develop their own
- v. Matt's statements have evolved which should not happen
- vi. The comp plan should have come first
- e. John Waldrop
 - i. Thanked group for their work
 - ii. Thru hiker on PNT
 - iii. Americana experience exceeded expectations
 - iv. Encountered 2 hikers but dozens of vehicles. It seems vehicles in the area should be a larger concern for Grizzly habitat

11/3

1. Matt M. – Nature and Purposes
 - a. Amendments for Managed Forests, Historic, Rec Uses, Wildlife (slide)
 - i. **Rosemary Seifried– What about the indigenous edits we talked about? Matt – We did get the language added – not sure how to include it but will work on it.**
 - ii. Katie LeBlanc - Recommendation – change the shelter farms sentence.
 - iii. Adam Sowards – Should not include managed forests since management has been a failed practice on forest lands.
 - iv. James Michaud – Just because it failed does not mean we stop managing
 - v. Mike Dawson – Favors the language but understands Adam's comments
 - vi. Randall Hansen – favors language
 - vii. Kevin Knauth – Those who manage lands are usually better off than those that don't. There are incentives for managing land.
 - viii. Diane Barlow – Is this language accurate?
 - ix. Clea Rome – I am willing to support as it is written.
 - x. James Michaud – managed means it is regulated on the ground. In the absence of an agency definition, we should refer to dictionary definition
 - xi. Brad Cownover – Managed applies to all in the sentence (i.e. grasslands, farms, ranches, etc.). We need to be able to show what it is about these areas that contributes to sense of place. Brad typed his version.
 - xii. Brad Smith – The intent is that users will experience these places. Recommends rewording to state that trail users may experience these things.
 - xiii. Rosemary Seifried – The AC and agencies may understand these terms and definitions but some of the public may not. Support Brad's comments on stating what users will experience but this does not mean it applies to all segments of the trail.
 - xiv. Mike Dawson – you cannot include something in the N&P and try to fix it in the comp plan with additional language. This language is not to document the existing condition but to show why the trail was designated.
 - xv. Diane Barlow – When it was designated, it was for the pristine and included other landscapes

- xvi. Jeff Kish – The towns/communities have a history. They have been there a long time using the surrounding land.
- xvii. Clea Rome – Struggle with the idea that the purpose of the trail is to steer it away for human modified landscapes. However, others on the council feel that human landscapes are equally important to the trail. How to capture this?
- xxviii. Dan Dinning – Gateway communities were part of the reason for this trail. The N&P should capture what trail users will experience
- xix. Mike Dawson – the national trail system act indicates that human develops should be avoided. Avoidance does not include the farms and managed forest but it does include many of the human modified developments. If we continue to change this, we will move away from consensus.
- xx. Jeff Chapman – we keep circling back. We cannot pretend those trail miles through developed area do not exist.
- xxi. Clea Rome – There is not consensus. We need to be careful of moving in one direction before we are ready to.
- xxii. Brock Milliner – working sounds better than managed
- xxiii. Matt M. – what about working forests vs managed forests?
- xxiv. Mike Dawson – Working landscapes is too wide open. Managed forest can mean a lot of things from harvesting to restoration which is okay.
- xxv. Diane Barlow – Managed seems like we can control it.
- xxvi. Brad Cownover – Avoid working and managed and use a more descriptive language. *Brad added changes to slide language.*
- xxvii. Ben J. – what about changing the rec uses. Motorized?
 - 1. Dan Dinning – What about existing motorized use? Matt – motorized use on the trails should eventually be changed to non-motorized but would not be changed on roads.
- xxviii. Comments on Brad Cownover changes (Brad typed them in) –
 - 1. Jessie Grossman – Supports language
 - 2. Brock Milliner – Support language
 - 3. Dan Dinning – Management needs to be addressed in the N&P. Does not support language without using managed. Likes previous version better.
 - 4. Katie LeBlanc – Recommend changing “equally” important to something else (“also” important?) - *change made*
 - 5. Clea Rome – What about use language that lands are or have been shaped by management without using managed.
 - 6. Dan Dinning – Okay with language stating lands are managed or working landscapes.
 - 7. Kevin Knauth – We are trying to hint that these lands are managed without saying it. Transparency is always best.
 - 8. Brad Cownover – I think this language is broad enough to include everything without having to label everything.
 - 9. Dan Dining and Jeff Chapman – do not agree that “shape” accurately addresses the issue.

10. James Michaud – The comp plan is guidance on how you get there. The FS needs to define N&P better or adopt regulations on what it means. The comp plan is a precursor to the real regulations that follow.
11. Brock Milliner – Not afraid of the plan language because there are laws that protect other uses. However, the plan can affect the political and social aspects which can lead to interference with harvests which is very damaging.
12. Ben J. – sensing on new language (added during break)
13. Wendy Walker – Use less poetic term (heartfelt to deep). *Matt made change*
14. Group discussion on using “may” include instead of include – decision to leave as include.

xxix. Purposes

1. Almer Casile – if mountain biking is not included it will likely be excluded.
2. Brock – Agrees that biking could be left out if not included
3. Mike Lithgow – I like just using just non-motorized. Non-motorized winter use is also not addressed. The same logic could be applied by not listing non-motorized winter uses in relation to Almer’s comment on excluding uses.
4. James Michaud – Leave out biking. We had consensus with non-motorized use. Why change it.
5. Diane Barlow – allowed by local management applies only to biking. Group commented that pack and saddle were also not allowed everywhere.
6. Diane Preibe – What about using “such as” to give examples instead of listing everything
7. Mike Dawson – what is meant by local management. Becky – according to OGC either local land managers or local management terms are fine as long as defined in the plan. Foot travel includes non-motorized winter use including skis, etc.
8. Majority supported changed language. However, Jeff Chapman does not agree with “allowed by local” manager language change.
9. James Michaud – why not use legislative language?
10. Jessie Grossman – All uses should be determined by local management including hiking, not just biking and pack and saddle. This would treat all uses equally
11. Brad Cownover – want to make individual sentences for each specific use.
12. Diane Barlow – If we put it in the purpose, it should apply to the whole trail which not all uses would. The N&P should refer to the whole trail. Maps show that segments have different uses. Matt M. the current language is the status quo (listed uses).

13. Matt M. – OGC wants language “where allowed by local managers/management” if the desire is to include existing uses.
 14. James Michaud – recommend leaving uses discussion to comp plan to another day in order to reach consensus. End sentence at opportunities.
 15. Ben J. – asked for thumbs up on current language. Majority supported but a few did not.
 16. James Michaud – We can be a dissenter without effecting consensus.
 17. Mike Dawson – If we do not list the uses, we cannot determine what is or what is not appropriate on the trail. It may not be legally required but it can effect conditions in the future.
 18. Randall – Understands both sides. However, prefers leaving it more general so it does not exclude something.
 19. Brad Smith – If it is not specific, it leaves the door open for problems in the future.
 20. Jeff Chapman – listing specifics may exclude something we did not consider.
 21. Brad Smith – What about general areas that are designated such as snowmobiling? **More research may be needed for over the snow travel.**
 22. Brock Milliner – The language is not going to prohibit DNR land uses since we will use local discretion to make decision.
 23. Jeff Chapman – Does not agree with language that may exclude or not recognize other uses.
 24. James Michaud – putting the period after opportunities offers flexibility for all other uses including motorized. Matt M. – this document is for the purpose of the trail. Motorized is not allowed.
 25. Becky B. – The N&Ps give Matt the areas to focus on the trial.
- xxx. Ben J. – Adding wildlife to list
1. Sensing for adding “and wildlife?”
 2. Diane Barlow – this is for safety with wildlife
 3. Brad Smith – we need to include information on bear country such as food storage, etc.
 4. Rosemary Seifield and Brock Milliner – it should include everything and not list specifics
 5. Kevin Knauth – Bear safety is already covered in most forest or other plans.
 6. Jessie Grossman – Bear issues are different and should at least be discussed by the AC
 7. Brad Smith – this is an important issue and specific to this trail and should be addressed.
 8. Brad Cownover – adding wildlife terms does not really equate to bear problems. Should be listed in existing conditions
 9. Brock Milliner – recommend sensing vote.
 10. Mike Dawson – adding partnerships was also suggested

11. Ben J. – sensing on existing language -?
 12. Dan Dinning – how far does surrounding landscapes extend.
 13. Mike Dawson – surrounding landscapes should be defined in the plan.
 14. Matt M. – this language should not limit uses near the trail. This is about interpretation.
- xxxi. Ben J. – sensing – about adding partnership. Majority agrees.
- xxxii. Ben J.- adding “indigenous people”
1. Ben J. – Adam recommended removing past and adding immemorial - all thumbs up
- xxxiii. Revisit Uses
1. Jeff Chapman – there is a possible bill allowing biking in wilderness
 2. Jessie Grossman – does the language about bikes address bikes not being allowed in wilderness or effect on potential wildernesses. Matt M. - The existing language would allow local manger to determine uses where appropriate
 3. James Michaud – different groups or lawyers can interpret it different. Matt M.– FS attorneys have addressed this for us.
 4. Kevin Knauth – Recommend placing language of “as allowed” at beginning of sentence instead to make it clear that it applies to all instead of having it at the end in parentheses.

b. Vote on nature of purposes as-is

1. **23 For**
2. **1 opposed – James Michuad – recommends eliminating listing the trail uses**

2. Presentations

- a. Ben ? - Registration boxes at Trailheads
 - i. Registration boxes to gather feedback about the trail and signage (handout)
 - ii. Kevin Knauth – Question on locations and vandalism. Do you get more comments because it is the PNT? – Not really sure. Kevin – it is hard to gauge how many users based on registration cards.
 - iii. Jessie Grossman – Are they located at other trailheads? Yes
 - iv. Jeff Chapman – Do you just use the registration or do you do NVUM or other surveys . This is separate from NVUM.
 - v. Dan Dinning – how to determine numbers.
 - vi. Ben ? - This not designed to gather user numbers
- b. Coulter Pence – Signing the PNNST (Power Point)
 - i. ROS, types of signage, sign plans, wilderness signing
 1. Kevin Knauth - Consider using wilderness guidelines for potential wilderness but not required. Do partners take ownership of their portion of the trail with their logos – Mike Dawson – yes they do.
 2. Mike Dawson – Recommends designing monument at end of trail to celebrate completion of the journey.

3. Brad Cownover – **Need to develop guidelines for the PNT and who makes the decision. Is this IDT or AC? How do we go about developing it?**
 4. Brock – How are signs in incorporate with DNR logos. Matt M. – we will work with other agencies.
 5. Mike Dawson – Marking the trail outside the wilderness. If not marked, it is hard to enforce regulations on the trail if people do not know they are on the trail. The AT is blazed but blazing is lacking on the PCT.
 6. Diane Barlow – What about using technology such as virtual signing or route finding. Could be used to complement but not replace markers. Rosemary Seifried – Reassurance markers are important for those not using maps or relying on apps or electronic maps.
 7. Diane Priebe – BLM land is more of a backcountry adventure. BLM is starting to standardize on portals signs so more guidelines may be available soon. Guide book coming soon.
 8. Rosemary Seifried – NPS standards are a big deal especially relating to materials used. We work with the PNTA. It would be good to coordinate the PNT plan with local plans.
 9. Wendy Walker – What is the history of the logo. Jeff Kish – Ron Strickland’s ex-girlfriend designed it.
 10. Raynelle Rino-Southon – Need to incorporate first peoples culture in the sign plan. Need conversation about incorporating diversity and cultural aspects in to the sign plan. Need to consider symbols (logo) and signage. Need transparency, dialogue, and counsel. **Need to know the story of the logo and meaning behind it to interpret it. Matt M. – perhaps this topic could be incorporated in to tribal consultation so we can get their feedback.**
 11. Pete Brown – incorporate the interpretive aspect in to sign plan
 12. Kevin Knauth – incorporate theme of the trail
 13. Diane Barlow – I did not know that this was the logo until now. It seems limited to a small segment of the trail. It does not reflect other parts of the trail. We could adopt a new logo but not suggesting that is needed.
3. Craig Newman – Plan Components (slide show)
 - a. Discussion
 - i. James Michaud – Is the AC supposed to write these? Becky B. - not necessarily write but incorporate the AC intent.
 - ii. Almer Casile – List all specific concerns and leave to staff to determine what appropriate Desired Conditions (DC) are. Matt M. – sideboards can be provided.
 - iii. Wendy Walker – *Do we want to determine trail capacity as a desired condition?* Matt M. - *No that part of the comp plan.*
 - iv. Jeff Chapman – Colville Forest Plan example. Do we stick to the recreational aspects only? Matt M. – Yes, just the Rec Aspect.
 - v. Mike Dawson – legislation requires us to look at an area of land not just linear feature. Rights-of-way. What makes it a NST – the lands though which it passes?

Therefore, conditions matter on surrounding land. Objectives may require consideration of surrounding uses.

- vi. Dan Dinning – How will the public be involved? What if the recommendation does not match what the public wants? Will the public believe that they have influence where they cannot change things? Matt M. I don't believe this is the case. We look at how the trail is managed as a whole. However, we work at the local levels for determining use. There are clauses that allow other uses to occur in the comp plan.
 - vii. Brad Cownover – What does the act state has to be incorporated in to the plan. Will this be the first NST to determine to use this process? Matt M. we will provide objectives and practices that will be used. We are the first along with one other new trail.
 - viii. James Michaud – Does not feel the FS has established rules and the rules keep changing. We are making it up as we go. Not sure if involvement is contributing or interfering. Need more clarification. **Matt, Craig, Becky – further discussion could help. James - Phone call in a few days.** Becky B. – the act is clear on what the minimum requirements are and can be provided. However, we can get more out of the council than just what is required. James – clarity in the plan and process is needed to help avoid litigation.
- b. Ben J. - Desired Conditions
- i. Ben J. recorded DCs on flip charts
 1. Brad C.
 2. Diane Barlow.
 3. Jeff C.
 4. Adam S.
 5. **Jeff K. – Need to record**, Pete, Jessie – economic sustainable,
 6. Dan D. – does not harm socially or culturally, ecologically,
 7. Cleo R. – Thoughtful connection to towns,
 8. Diane Barlow. – Have virtual website about cultural, history, etc. Story is told
 9. Mike D. – Protect zoned trail experience
 10. Diane P. – Partners, stewards
 11. Randall H. – Long term agreements and easements with landowners
 12. Rosemary S. – Intentional and clear education and data gathering
 13. Mike D. – Visitor use mgmt. plan
 14. Katie L. – Challenge of backcountry and trail exists. Maintain wildness
 15. Jeff C. – adequate appropriations
 16. Diane Barlow. – adequate maintenance for safe travel
 17. Jessie G. – Recovery and restoration of all resource areas
 18. Almer C. – Enhance quality of life and tourism/economy
 19. Raynelle – Targeted for younger generations
 20. Jeff K. – Adequate campsite areas
 21. Diane P. – Enhance visual resources
 22. Kevin N. – Ensure maintenance of system start to finish

23. Diane Brockway – Self reliance
 24. Kevin K. – User feedback for enhancement
 25. Adam – Feedback Loop
 26. Rosemary – active PNTA
 27. Diane Brockway – waterway protection
 28. Mike L. – Continue collaboration with other designated trails
 29. Diane P. – Management focus on Scenic character
 30. Cleo R. – Design minimizes users conflicts
 31. Jeff C. – Integration with other businesses
 32. Adam S. – Integrate permits with all those required. Jeff K. agrees to prevent holdups for thru hikers. Mike D. – now is the time to address this issue as it will be getting more complicated.
 33. Scotty S. – Interpretation to talk about value of public land.
 34. Dan D. – The ends have more use. Required permits in remote areas will lose local support for those sections. Jeff K. – only long distance hikers would apply. Jessie and Dan – this needs to be made clear.
 35. Mike L. – Winter non-motorized use needs to be considered in design where applicable
 36. Raynelle – Accessibility and diversity. Inclusiveness. Brad – Accessibility standards and guidelines will apply to at least federal land – may be able to incorporate to other sections.
 37. Pete B. – Cabin rental program
- ii. Discussion
1. James M. – question –about sub headings. Becky - No bearing on what is required
 2. Mike D. – How to move forward. Matt M. – IDT and volunteers from AC develop ideas for next meeting. Send emails to Matt M.
 3. Rosemary
 4. Jeff C. – Accessibility requirements. **Matt M. – We will look in to requirements and provide more information.** Brad C. – we have standards that will extend to state and others. It would be good to adopt for all sections. Mike D. – compliance can be simple and does not mean paving. Different levels of ability. **Brad C. – Recommends presentation at next meeting.**
- c. Public Comments
- i. Michael Sawiel - Thru Hiker
 1. Trail raises awareness for protecting wild character, wildlife, etc. Stumbled on PNT after quitting job in professional realm. Ultimately connected to everything around you. People are amazing as scenery. The trail made this happen. Like to see the route kept to original route as much as possible. What you are doing here is important to getting more people involved. It extends well above the trail itself.
 - ii. Ron Cron – Biking advocate

1. We are here to influence the future. 4% are younger generation and 75% of that group ride a bike. We need to provide the next generation with opportunities that we enjoyed. Many trails have been taken away from us in this area. The season is short. What impact is a bike going to have during that short period of time. Not allowing bikes will result in a drop in the amount of use on the trail. Fewer kids are using the forest. More tools available will help get them out. They are the future stewards. Please consider bikes for future generations.
- iii. Abby VanDettey – Thru Hiker
 1. Solo hiker. What makes the trail is the land it passes through. Fell in love with the communities and individuals. It touched many people in numerous ways. You are here because you love the land it passes through. Love of the lands should be used to make your decisions.
- iv. Eric Oliver - Thru Hiker
 1. Thru Hikers are the most dedicated to conservation. The proposed reroute in Yak Valley. Conservation is a core value. Studies on grizzly do not show a clear conflict between hikers and grizzly. I have confidence in the NEPA process. Thru Hiker in the Yak Valley are an asset. Consider all perspectives.
- d. Closing
 - i. Brock Milliner – Recommend public comments earlier in day
 - ii. Diane Barlow – Likes end of the day for comments
 - iii. Jessie Grossman – Can we provide input on the agenda on where public comments would be best inserted.
 - iv. Mike Dawson – Round of applause for those not required to be here
 - v. Wendy Walker – Discussion on public comments not covered. Matt M. – ran out of time. Cover next time
 - vi. Jeff Chapman – Future meetings for subcommittees and communities.
 - vii. Diane Barlow – When will we meet next. **Matt M. – decide on schedule in the next month.**
 - viii. Brad Cownover – In favor of virtual meeting in February to stay on task. **Matt M. - will look in to options.**
 - ix. **Wendy Z. – Need train receipts, car rental, POV mileage, etc.**